



Washington State Roadmap

Roadmap Advisory Group Meeting Notes

August 23, 2006 (1:30 – 3:30)

OFM Pt Plaza West Training Room

Attendees

Dan Ashby, DSHS
Stephanie Atkins, HCA
Julie Boyer, Sterling
Derek Basham, OFM
Scott Came, DIS
Rick Cook, DSHS
Tom Dhamers, LOT
Susan Dodson, OFM
Michelle French, OFM

Rex Garrett, LNI
Cynthia Harris, LNI
Maria Hug, WSP
Wendy Jarrett, OFM
Gary Maciejewski, DOC
Debbie Ocheltree, DRS
Wolfgang Opitz, OFM
Tom Parma, DIS
Kathy Rosmond, OFM

Mariann Schols, DSHS
Allen Schmidt, OFM
Randy Simmons, LCB
Chuck Smith, DIS
Scott Turner, DOP
Tristan Wise, GA
Marcy Yates, DOT
Steve Young, DOP

Handouts

- Advisory group [presentation](#).

Agenda and Meeting Expectations

Kathy Rosmond welcomed advisory group members, reviewed the meeting agenda and introduced Wolfgang Opitz to speak about the executive sponsor direction for the *Roadmap*.

Executive Sponsor Direction

Wolfgang Opitz shared copies of the Information Services Board (ISB) and executive cabinet briefing on the *Roadmap* project. He noted that the ISB presentation was an informational briefing made at their request and that the message to both the ISB and the executive cabinet was the same: Very little has been decided yet. The feasibility study is evaluating the options so we can make informed decisions. The big question is how best to balance agency with enterprise needs.

Wolfgang explained the importance of evaluating *all* of the ideas that came out of the modeling sessions in the feasibility study. He also announced that a major focus of the feasibility study would be on decision support for performance measurement. He pointed out that the state has a tradition of getting data right but needs better tools to be able to continue getting it right.

Project Update / Communications

Kathy Rosmond reviewed communications since May and gave a brief project update on milestone 3 and the feasibility study. The executive sponsors have asked the project team to look at what could be done to provide better decision support for performance measurement as the primary focus of the *Roadmap* feasibility study.

Discussion on moving forward

Robin Madsen facilitated a discussion on *Roadmap* challenges and opportunities. Feedback from the modeling and feasibility study focus group sessions indicated some concerns about whether agency needs were being heard and adequately represented. The group discussed their concerns and made suggestions for improvement. The discussion is summarized [below](#). Advisory Group members also voiced their support for moving forward with the *Roadmap* so agencies and the state can:

- Meet increasing demands for performance measurement and other enterprise information
- Come up with consistent data sets for GMAP, which is now a manual effort at many agencies
- Optimize programs and business operations based on performance measurement data
- Get in alignment with benchmarks and become more competitive by streamlining our business processes
- Relieve overworked staff; we need to “be able to let go of the \$25 dollar payments”
- Have more standard processes, more transferable skills and a more mobile work force
- Understand what we’re buying and get the best value for the taxpayer’s dollar
- Solve the dilemma of aging systems with a sustainable and scalable enterprise solutions
- Be ready for JLARC competitive contracting audits

- Meet the increasing demands of legislature; new initiatives are coming every year
- Have a modern enterprise general ledger and COA that addresses emerging enterprise needs such as performance measurement and full cost accounting, aligns accounting with budget and supports both governmental and business operations
- Enter data once rather than re-entering into multiple systems
- Reduce the costs of maintaining so many system silos
- Eliminate duplicative functionality across state systems
- Solve problems with billing for grants and 1099 tax reporting in HRMS
- Ease the amount of effort it takes for agencies to compile and compare empirical data
- Become more agile by establishing a policy and IT portfolio within natural architectural boundaries

Next Steps / Process Check

Kathy announced that Finance Officers and CIO's from select agencies will be asked to help collect information for the feasibility study baseline cost model in September.

The next Roadmap Advisory Group meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 27 in the OFM Training Room at Point Plaza from 1:30-3:30 pm.

Summary of Discussion on *Roadmap* Challenges and Opportunities

Areas of Concern:	Advisory Group advice:
Agency needs are not being articulated and documented in a way that ensures they will be addressed	Look at agencies' unique needs and evaluate whether each option can meet those needs
The HRMS implementation has been difficult	Pay close attention to lessons learned from the HRMS project
Requirements are at a very high level Doing the feasibility study before more detailed requirements may result in a solution that doesn't meet agency needs If needs mandated by Federal requirements and other partners are not met by an enterprise solution, agencies would have to develop shadow systems	Use the feasibility study to choose a direction but collect more detailed requirements before selecting the technical solution Identify connectivities and dependencies -- all the parts need to work together
Agencies didn't realize the <i>Roadmap</i> would impact program areas and not just finance; Program managers were not adequately represented at the modeling sessions	Be clearer about the need for program representation at future requirements sessions
The private and public sector are different; solutions that work in business may not be appropriate for the state	Make sure we have real life examples from other jurisdictions to prove how proposed solutions can work
It's extremely difficult to change laws in state government A law/policy change may come out looking completely different than originally envisioned	Make sure we have a realistic timeframe since it might take a series of attempts to change policy and law Be aware of potential unexpected outcomes
Disconnect between <i>Roadmap</i> policy and process improvements and the Auditor	Coordinate changes with the State Auditor's Office
Mandates will be required, with costs attached but no budget The need for training and knowledge transfer	Include adequate resources for implementation, training and ongoing maintenance in feasibility study costs

Areas of Concern:	Advisory Group advice:
may be underestimated Feasibility study won't look at allocation of resources	Make sure agencies have the resources to implement
Not sure we'll have legislature support to get the amount of funding we need We may still be doing the same thing 10 years from now.	Need to establish a clear and consistent message with all agencies so it resonates with legislators
The <i>Roadmap</i> governance model doesn't allow appropriate agency input Since all of the sponsoring agencies are small/medium, large agencies don't feel well represented Customers need more of a voice in the vision	Give customers more of a voice Don't expect Central Service Agencies' to think of everything Consider adopting the HRMS' large agency committee model
An Enterprise Solution may create losses to agencies Some agencies may end up with less functionality; agencies want to make sure they can continue to do quality work Make sure agencies understand they may not get 100% functionality with an enterprise approach	Communicate realistic expectations Spend time and effort dealing with "take aways" / Understanding of agency losses Conduct a risk analysis on impact of taking an enterprise approach and manage the enterprise solution to acceptable risks Identify what agencies need and what they will get Make sure we understand what agencies will be giving up and be candid about it
Doesn't feel like there is enterprise buy-in / Enterprise solution not embraced	Involve agencies in the decision process so we can get the support to make this work
Enterprise solution could mean vendor monopoly and control over future/potential solutions	Look for case studies and best practices in other states
There seems to be a need for more data but the data's value and who will use it once it is collected is not clear It will be difficult to standardize the general ledger and chart of accounts	Make changes to general ledger and chart of accounts first - they are the foundation
Agencies need to know direction soon so they can make plans	Discuss the draft feasibility study with Advisory Group agencies before it is finalized
Agencies need direction on agency specific projects in short run	Establish direction/guidelines about how agencies can move forward outside of the <i>Roadmap</i> (see the Urgent Business Need Strategy on the <i>Roadmap</i> website) Identify restrictions